

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 22 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has rewritten this claim as suggested and it is accordingly believed in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-21 were rejected as obvious over United States Patent No. 4,271,500 to *Van Handel et al.*, in view of *Gospe et al.*, United States Patent No. 6,029,730. United States Patent No. 6,180,926 to *Duddy et al.* was also noted, though not relied upon.

The interview of July 15, 203 is gratefully acknowledged. Applicant points out again that the secondary reference, *Gospe et al.* '730 does not relate to reciprocating machinery and thus there is not believed to be any motivation to combine that reference with *Van Handel et al.* '500. In any event, Claims 1-21 were rejected only on the basis of obviousness. That rejection is believed overcome by the *Markwell Declaration* filed in May, 2002 which sets forth superior and unexpected results:

Utilizing cast-in heaters in place of the previously used ring heaters has produced unexpected results. Indeed, with the use of cast-in heaters, we have been able to virtually eliminate heater failures. Between March 1, 2001 and February 28, 2002, the ten pressing machines described above have experienced only 7 cast-in heater failures requiring replacement of the cast-in heater. This represents a substantial decrease from the number of ring heater failures mentioned above -- 7 cast-in heater failures over a one-year period for ten pressing machines operating a total of 100 cast-in heaters versus 345 ring heater failures over a one-year period for four pressing machines operating a total of 60 ring heaters.

Declaration of Dana Markwell, May, 2002. In view of the *Declaration*, Claims 1-21 are believed clearly allowable. *See* MPEP, Section 716(a) and following; *note also*, *In re Chupp*, 2 USPQ2d 1437 (CAFC 1987).

Applicant has also added new Claims 23-26 which claim additional structural features. These claims are believed allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 22 is allowable -- the art does not remotely suggest the newly-recited features.

Support for language in Claims 23-26 not found in original Claim 8 is found especially in Figures 6, 7, 9-11 and 14, as well as the discussion relating thereto. Figure 9, for example, shows an annular shape for the heater with central hole 208. See also, page 23, line 9 of the specification. None of the references disclose or suggest the newly-recited features and accordingly, these new claims are believed allowable as well.

For example, while Gospe *et al.* '730 teaches the use of cast-in heaters, Col. 4, line 51, neither this reference nor any of the other references suggests the advantages of a cast-in heater recessed into a movable die set as is claimed.

In view of the above amendments and the dramatic improvements made of record, all claims are believed allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael W. Ferrell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,158

Ferrells, PLLC
P.O. Box 312
Clifton, Virginia 20124-1706
Telephone: 703-266-3000
Facsimile: 703-266-6000
July 17, 2003